UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Is Religious Liberty Dead In America?

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Six Months After Gandhi's Arrest

By

RICHARD B. GREGG

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 20

Chicago, August 1, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Is Religious Liberty Dead in America?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 307
A Meditation on Modern Religion—A. EUSTACE HAYDON..... 311

ARTICLES—

Six Months After Gandhi's Arrest—RICHARD B. GREGG..... 312
Highways and Byways—H. S. N..... 315

THE STUDY TABLE—

Norman Thomas: American Leader—HARRY ELMER BARNES.. 317
The British Conquest of India. India's Side—J. T. SUNDERLAND 317
The Literature of Horror—J. H. H..... 317

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Socialist Party and Prohibition—CLARENCE SENIOR..... 318
President Hoover's Plea for Disarmament—SYDNEY STRONG.... 318
The Teaching of Religion—SPENCER M. DEGOLIER..... 318
The Centralia Case: An Appeal—C. S. SMITH..... 318
Whither Are We Drifting?—P. MALOFF..... 318

THE FIELD—

Sidelights on the Indian Round Table—REGINALD REYNOLDS... 306
American-German Cultural Co-operation..... 319
Kagawa Still Carries On—*Christian Century*..... 320

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Sidelights on the Indian Round Table

[From Our Special Correspondent]

In a former article* I undertook to explain in greater detail the facts underlying the Round Table fiasco.

The wrangles of the Conference "delegates," unimportant as they are, serve to illustrate the meaning of *Dyarchy*. *Dyarchy* is the basis of India's existing government, and its major characteristics are as follows:

(1) India is governed by British officials, assisted by Indian legislative councils and assemblies.
(2) The officials are appointed, directly or indirectly, by the British Government. The Assembly and Councils are elected by the Indian propertied classes (i.e., 2½ per cent. of the population, selected on a property qualification).
(3) Only certain specified subjects come within the competence of the Councils and Assembly.
(4) Measures *passed* in the Assembly or Councils can be *vetoed* by the Viceroy (or the Governor of the Province in question).
(5) The Viceroy can *pass* measures *rejected* by the Assembly or Councils by "certification."

It is quite clear that no serious person would ever enter such legislative bodies as these with any hope or intention of finding there the beginnings of self-government. Indian democracy has never been concerned with them as such, and even when the Swarajist Party contested the Council elections (after the suspension of Civil Disobedience in 1922) it was simply as part of their obstructive tactics. Mahatma Gandhi has always believed in ignoring them.

Nevertheless, a class existed to which the new machinery of government meant fame, honor and distinction—even wealth. This was the Indian propertied class, accustomed to vaunt British titles with all the pride of a footman wearing his master's livery. The Rai Bahadurs and Khan Bahadurs and the Indian knights of commerce scrambled almost indecently for the privilege of writing M. L. A. or M. L. C. after their names. In the mock majesty of their Parliaments they saw themselves as ministers and lawgivers.

Only about three-quarters of the members of the Legislative Assembly are elected by this class. The rest consist of "European" (i.e., the British community, represented out of all proportion to its numerical strength) officials and nominated members. These last include the so-called "representatives" of Labor and the depressed classes (nominated by the Government).

The relationship between the Round

*"Why the Conference Failed," published in UNITY, March 7, 1932.

(*Continued on page* 319)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1932 Number 20

Is Religious Liberty Dead in America?

"My own impression is that religious bigotry played a part, but not a decisive part, in the outcome (of the Democratic National Convention)."—Walter Lippman, in the New York *Herald-Tribune*, July 6, 1932.

Walter Lippman, freshly returned from the Democratic Convention in Chicago, and not at all unfavorably inclined toward the outcome of that convention, could not as an honest and capable observer close his eyes to the religious bigotry which smoldered among the delegates. He knows, and therefore confesses, that this bigotry played a large part in the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for president on the Democratic ticket. Only he does not think it was "a decisive part"! His general conclusion is undeniable; his guarded reservation very questionable. For reasons which we hope to make sun-clear in this statement, and which reach far back of the Chicago Convention itself we believe the nomination of Roosevelt marks one of the most sinister triumphs for religious bigotry that has ever disgraced this country. It raises anew the inescapable question—Can any man who is not a Protestant Christian be elected to the high office of president of the United States?

I.

In order to understand the setting of the Democratic Convention, and what emerged from it, one must ponder the extraordinary factors which were present. Never in any political convention was there a more curious concatenation of circumstances. It is the search for a cause of the smooth inter-locking and inter-working of these circumstances, to the end of prompt and decisive nomination of Roosevelt for the presidency, which points us to the truth.

First and foremost, of course, was the "wet" sentiment of the Convention. This was amazing, even in the light of the recent swing away from Prohibition, when one considers the Democratic history of four years ago, with its non-committal plank on law-enforcement in its platform, followed by a repudiation of this plank by the dripping "wet" candidate, "Al" Smith, and the repudiation of the candidate in turn by the South which has been for generations the bulwark of the Democratic Party. The break-up of the solid South in the Hoover-Smith campaign—the capture by the Republicans of several states below Mason and Dixon's line—must be ranked as one of the most sensational political phenomena of modern times. We were strenuously told that the explanation of this astounding event was the fixed "dry" sentiments of the Protestants of the South who have stern convictions, still act upon convictions, and thus could not conscientiously support a candidate of Smith's "wet" type. This undoubtedly played its part, for Smith was partly defeated by "dry" votes in the last campaign, as Roosevelt will be terribly menaced, if not actually defeated, by them in the present campaign. But how does this explanation, as a basic or primary fact, fit what took place at Chicago. As we see it, there are only three possibilities in the Democratic story of 1928-1932.

First, the southern Democrats were honest and straightforward in their contention four years ago that they were fighting Smith solely on the liquor issue. But in this case there would surely be a new and more terrible revolt of these same Protestant voters of the South against the latest platform and candidate of their Party—a platform which binds every Democrat as by the fetters of a creed, to the repeal of the 18th Amendment, and a candidate who discovers suddenly, at the correct moment, after long shilly-shallying on this as on every other issue, that he was as "wet" as "Al" Smith, i. e., "100 per cent." But there are no visible signs of earthquake in the South. On the contrary, the South seems significantly quite content. In the Convention yesterday, Governor Roosevelt received the delegates' votes of all the southern states; and, in the election tomorrow, no one doubts that he will receive the electoral votes of all these same states. The solid South has closed its ranks in support of a campaign which will be directed first and last to the repeal of the 18th Amendment and the complete overthrow of Prohibition.

A second possibility is that the southern Democrats were sincere enough in their "dry" convictions and actions four years ago, but are now converted to the "wet" cause. Like others of their fellow-citizens, they may have miraculously repented of their sins and would make swift and complete atonement. But if

this is the case, surely they would not have turned their backs on "Al" Smith! On the contrary, would they not naturally, inevitably have returned to the man whom they deserted on this liquor issue in 1928, and thus make good their penitence by lifting him to triumphant leadership in 1932? After the adoption of the Chicago platform, with its utter repudiation of the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Act, there was but one man among all their leaders whom the Democrats could consistently nominate for the presidency. This man was Alfred E. Smith! He had a right to the nomination on this platform. Had he not, like a later Moses, gone out into the desert wilderness, and there paid the price for his premature "wet" convictions? Smith was justified in reminding the Chicago delegates that they were only this year catching up to where he stood four years before, and, as he added—"Look what I paid for it!" But Smith also was the one candidate who promised success on this platform, if such success was what the Democrats really wanted. The outstanding leader and statesman of the Democratic Party, he was uniquely identified with the "wet" cause. Through many a weary year he has toiled for it, and in his toil acquired a knowledge, experience and prestige which are matched by no other champion of repeal. This cause belonged to Smith, as Smith belonged to the cause. Smith's record, his popularity, his consistency, his courage, his capacity, his sacrifice for essential political and personal integrity, all dictated his nomination at Chicago. Yet he was turned down for another man who would have as quickly and gladly served his ambition on a "dry" platform as on a "wet," had the Convention so determined. Obviously, there were factors at work here altogether apart from that passion for Prohibition repeal which was the one avowed interest of the Chicago delegates.

Failing these alternatives, there remains a third and final possibility—that the southern Democrats were dishonest in their blatant declaration that they were opposed to Smith in 1928 purely on grounds of "dry" conviction. These politicians have undergone no change in their attitude toward their party's late candidate. Amid various and sudden transformations of opinion, dictated by familiar influences of partisan expediency, they remain fixed in opposition at all costs and under all conditions to Smith. Which means that, politically, the South was never concerned primarily with Prohibition, and never moved to revolt on its behalf! Any claim that the Democratic presidential candidate in 1928 was repudiated merely by "dry" sentiment in southern states is now made ridiculous by the record of the Chicago Convention. "Dry" sentiment played its part in the last campaign, as it will most assuredly play its part in this campaign; but we now know, if we did not know before, that the southern Democrats were insincere in their protestations that it played the chief part. It is today as clear as crystal that what happened in 1928 sprang predominantly from other causes, for which the liquor issue was a happily available camouflage.

II.

If we would understand what was at work in the South, and elsewhere in 1928, we must see what has been assiduously at work ever since. The movement against "Al" Smith within the Democratic Party did not end with the last election. The defeated candidate was still the titular head of the Party; and its chairman, Raskob, Smith's bosom friend, was still in control of the organization. These men must be gotten rid of! So the South early set on foot an anti-Smith movement, headed for the convention of 1932. This movement organized itself around the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for reasons not far to seek. He possessed a marvelous name, was himself an amiable, attractive, and prominent figure. He had personal and family connections with the South. His great victories in New York gubernatorial contests made him politically conspicuous. He was fortunately a friend of "Al," and thus an ideal cover for attacks upon Smith which the latter's enemies were not any too willing to proclaim. Above all, he was weak in character and inordinately ambitious, and thus a pliant tool for any kind of work. So Roosevelt suddenly became the cherished leader of the southern Democracy. But never at any time were the Democrats concerned with loyalty to him. They had no native enthusiasm for the New York Governor. Their real emotions were centered in their hatred and fear of Smith.

The South, however, cannot nominate, as it cannot elect, a presidential candidate without assistance. Early in the Roosevelt campaign for the nomination, it became necessary to "sell" the New York Governor to other parts of the country. This was particularly easy in the middle and far West, where any opposition to Smith was welcome. Thereupon was presented a scenario, so to speak, of Roosevelt, which outdid in imaginative fantasy the most extravagant productions of Hollywood. This aristocrat of New York, sheltered graduate of exclusive schools and colleges, wealthy country gentleman, suddenly becomes a "dirt" farmer, who suffers the trials and therefore understands the needs of the distressed farming population of the western states. With equal suddenness he takes on the character of a Bryan progressive, the heroic champion of forlorn causes, the devoted friend of "the forgotten man," and thus wins to his support hosts of Democrats who seek genuine popular reforms. In the same way he is made to appear independent, brave, a constructive thinker, a fearless leader, a foe of political corruption and dishonor, though no citizen of New York, however watchful, had ever discovered such qualities. In all this there is something highly amus-

ing—Roosevelt offered as successor to and substitute for Smith as a popular idol, a radical reformer, a friend and champion of the common people! But the West "fell for it," and thus took Roosevelt as its candidate.

But this combination was not enough. When the hosts gathered in Chicago, the Roosevelt strength in the Convention was at least one hundred votes short. Where could these votes be found? They were there, ready for timely action.

First, McAdoo and the California delegation! Consider McAdoo's record! Southern born and bred; for years a conspicuous "dry"; political champion and leader of the Ku Klux Klan; beaten in 1924 for the Democratic nomination for the presidency by "Al" Smith; relegated in that year to obscurity, with vengeance rankling in his heart like poison. He bides his time, this year sees his chance to stage a comeback, and joins with Wilson's old enemy, Hearst, in vigorous and successful promotion of Garner's candidacy in California. When the hour comes to sell out in Chicago, McAdoo does so, with fine moral flourish, in spite of the fact that California had repudiated Roosevelt in its primaries by an overwhelming vote. McAdoo now vigorously declares that he did not sell out because he asked no price. This remains to be seen if Roosevelt is elected!

Next, Hearst! His record is so familiar as to need no recital. Its one consistent feature is a consuming desire to get his hands upon the White House. Failing to gain entrance into the sacred precincts himself, Hearst has more recently sought to choose and elect some personal favorite to be president. In the present pre-convention campaign, Speaker Garner had his vigorous support. Against Roosevelt as the leading contender in the field, Hearst rages day after day in front-page editorials in all his newspapers printed above his own august signature. "Al" Smith, hated by Hearst through many years, and opposed by him in 1928, because of Smith's refusal politically to associate or do business with him, shares this gross antipathy. At the critical moment in the Convention, assured of Smith's defeat, and promised the vice-presidency for his favorite, Hearst forgets on the instant his well-posed enmity for Roosevelt, and swings with avidity to his support.

And Garner! Favorite son of Texas, which is significantly one of the southern states which repudiated Smith in 1928. Pushed by McAdoo and Hearst, and rewarded with a real vice-presidential nomination in exchange for his strategic but unsubstantial hopes for a presidential nomination, this practiced politician does not long delay his part in the most shameless political bargain of recent years.

III

Such is the story of the last few years, and of the last few days of those years! Can there be any doubt, after the recital of this story, that the Roosevelt candidacy was essentially anti-Smith in origin and character, and derived all its strength and momentum and final victory from the fervency of hatred, the bitterness of intolerance, against the man whom Roosevelt had long claimed as friend? And can there also be any slightest measure of doubt as to the rhyme and reason of this terrific opposition to the late standard-bearer of the Democratic host? This opposition sprang not partly, as Walter Lippman is regretfully forced to concede, nor yet wholly, but none the less decisively from religious bigotry, directed against Alfred E. Smith as a Roman Catholic. Of course, there were other factors involved in this opposition—factors personal, partisan, political, practical. But the main factor, covertly concealed and even denied but none the less dominant, operating against Smith vehemently in the South, and in a lesser degree also in the West and other sections of the country, both in the electoral campaign of 1928 and in the pre-convention campaign of 1932, was his religious affiliations.

"Al" Smith is feared and hated as only a Fundamentalist Protestant, a Ku Kluxer, an Orangeman can fear and hate a Catholic. It is bigotry, and bigotry alone, which is adequate to explain the peculiar hostility which has raged against him ever since he moved in 1924 from the sidewalks of New York to the broad highways of the nation. It is only this which can explain the action of Smith, most loyal of men, in starting determinedly but too late to head off and defeat the presidential ambitions of one who had long been cherished as his friend. An attack upon himself he could ignore, but not upon his faith! In the same way can nothing else explain the propaganda, fastened early upon the Chicago Convention, that of all the competing candidates, Smith was the only one who could not be elected. Why, *per contra,* was he not, as the perfect embodiment of the liquor issue now alleged to be so triumphantly popular throughout the land, the only candidate who could not be defeated? But especially must we turn to religious bigotry to explain the acceptance of Roosevelt as the nominee. It is easy to understand the otherwise cold and unresponsive nature of this acceptance. On the one hand, the New York Governor has nothing of his rival's strength—Smith's wide political experience, his huge popularity, his outspoken sincerity and courage, his extraordinary executive capacity, his pervasive humanity, his sure progressive instinct for democratic principles and liberal policies of administration. On the other hand, Roosevelt has all his rival's weaknesses. As listed in the 1928 campaign, these weaknesses were four in number. Smith came from New York, which is arrogating to itself all too much political power and prestige. But Roosevelt also comes from New York! Smith was a "wet"—a serious handicap four years ago

and a more serious handicap this year than most politicians are able to foresee. But Roosevelt is now equally a "wet"—he became so overnight when a reading of the Chicago platform changed him marvelously from mildly "moist" to soppingly "soaked." Smith was a Tammany man, and therefore an associate of the corruptest crowd of political gangsters in the nation. But Roosevelt has also associated intimately with Tammany, and in a year when the most hopeful attack since the last days of "Boss" Croker was directed against the Wigwam, lent aid and comfort to the enemies of all good government in New York. All Smith's weaknesses —save only one! In the last campaign, Smith labored under the vast disability of being a Roman Catholic. But Roosevelt, in addition to his magnetic name, his charming personality, and his political availability, is a perfectly respectable, even orthodox, Protestant. Who can imagine that he would have been nominated had he been a Catholic? Bigotry fed fat on Smith four years ago, and now it tosses his well-picked bones to the dogs of ignorance, prejudice and hate.

IV.

The Chicago Convention of the Democratic Party was the last act of the saddest drama of religious intolerance that this country has ever seen. What this means to "Al" Smith as a man and a politician does not concern me. Recognizing without reserve his admirable and exceptional qualities, I have none the less never supported him in any of his campaigns, save as I have sought by voice and pen to vindicate his right to his own religious faith without hindrance or hurt from his fellow-citizens. But years ago I solemnly vowed never to support a Tammany man for any office; also, as a convinced Prohibitionist, I must necessarily oppose the outstanding champion in American life of booze. I am thus as indifferent to Smith as I am to Hoover.

I am likewise but little interested in what this issue of religious intolerance means to the Democratic Party. It is true that I cannot refrain from blushing for very shame as I read this record of a party which hails as its founder and patron saint the immortal Jefferson, foremost liberal of his age, and throughout his life the indefatigable exponent and defender of religious toleration. I must also smile at the sheer impudence of men who can clamor for the full liberty of the individual to have a drink, and with the same breath deny to this individual the full liberty to preach and practice the religion of his soul. But I long since became an independent in politics, and am as indifferent to the one as I am to the other of the two old parties.

What concerns me in the fate of "Al" Smith is the betrayal of the nation. This republic was founded, if I mistake not, as the abode of liberty. Lincoln at least assumed so when he described America as "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Central to this ideal of liberty is religious liberty. The right to worship God in our own way, according to the dictates of our own conscience, in conformity with the sacred traditions and practices of our own fathers, or the right not to worship God at all, if such be our will, this right runs deeper and reaches farther than any other right to freedom that we possess. If this liberty of the spirit is safe, all liberties are safe; if this liberty be impaired, infringed upon, denied or destroyed, all liberties are instantly in jeopardy. This nation cannot endure as a democracy if all churches are not equal before the law, and all faiths free to its people. America is no longer America if every humblest, and also every greatest citizen cannot bow before his own peculiar altar and still be secure in the enjoyment of every civil right and every social privilege. Yet here we are served with notice that a Roman Catholic cannot be elected and therefore should not be nominated, to the highest office in the land! It has long been elementary that presidential candidates must be Christians. What chance would a Jew have to gain official admittance to the White House? Why was the mention of so eminent a man as Justice Brandeis for president silenced within twenty-four hours of the first unguarded whisper of his name? How would an atheist, or even an agnostic fare in his quest of this supreme political reward? Was Ingersoll wrong when, asked what he paid for his fine set of Voltaire's works, he replied, "the governorship of Illinois"? But now we discover that it is not enough for a presidential aspirant to possess the non-constitutional qualification of being a Christian. He must also be a *Protestant* Christian. A Catholic worships the same God, reads the same Bible, follows the same Christ. But he also reverences the Pope, and therefore is not fit to be entrusted with the guidance of the republic. This is bigotry of the worst description. It raises flatly and frankly the question—Is religious liberty any longer alive in America?

It remains only to inquire how far Franklin D. Roosevelt was himself responsible for this anti-Smith, anti-Catholic campaign. It would be easy to argue that he was not responsible at all, for the simple reason, admirably stated by John Dewey, that the New York Governor has never shown any ability either to lead or to control his party. We might add that he has likewise never shown any desire to do so, being amiably content to accept whatever the party has to offer. But Roosevelt was directly involved in the defeat of Mr. Shouse as permanent chairman of the Convention, an action which was unnecessary, unwise, unfair, but conveniently substituted for Mr. Shouse a distinguished Catholic, Senator Walsh, of Montana. The significance of this move is unmistakable. It was shrewdly managed to silence a charge of religious discrimination all too ready to be shouted out loud. In

this shameful, because dishonorable act of the anti-Smith crowd, says Walter Lippman, in his July 6th article, religious bigotry "was most manifest." For this act Governor Roosevelt must himself carry full share of responsibility.

Thus has the conspiracy triumphed. It is the custom to keep such conspiracies hidden away—to say nothing about them, to hush them up, to deny that they exist. There is a curious feeling among Americans that frank confession of a fact of this sort dishonors the nation, as though the fact itself were not the dishonor and confession of it the first step toward its removal. UNITY will be bitterly assailed for bringing this subject out into the open of public discussion. But this paper has for more than fifty years stood stanch and true for religious freedom. It has welcomed to the household of its spirit men of all churches and all creeds. As its editor, in succession to the saintly and prophetic Jenkin Lloyd Jones, I should feel faithless to my duty did I not raise my voice in exposure and denunciation of this instance of intolerable bigotry. When wickedness is done, it should be known. As surely as I have believed all my life that any attack upon religious liberty is treason to the state and to the soul of man, I would have this latest attack shouted abroad, that it may be seen for what it is, and punished as it deserves.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Meditation on Modern Religion

The social and intellectual climate of our age has a devastating effect upon old religions. For thousands of years they have changed to meet the altered conditions of each new era. Now they falter in bewilderment and begin to sink into decadence. Anthropologists and historians hurry to collect materials which they realize will soon be dead debris lost under the exuberant growth of new social forms. There can be no doubt of the fact of radical change. Even in America and Europe the new generation has lost devotion and loyalty to the ancient faith and the Western world is conservative in comparison with the modern East. What is the meaning of this chasm widening in the present between the past and the future? Is it an end or a beginning? There are many, eminently wise, who assert that it is the end and rejoice that at last man is escaping from the net of "superstition" woven about him in the pre-scientific ages. There are others, historically minded, who say that now the old religions must die that religion may live; that we are witnessing the birth of a new and living religion.

One thing is abundantly clear—that religion in our age can no longer be expressed in the old ideas nor channeled in the institutional forms of the past. Unless it can be the unifying, directive force in the total structure of our secular life religion cannot for long retain vitality as a thing apart. Religion, when it is vital, is a way of living, a program for leading socialized desires to fulfilment. It is axiomatic in the religious sciences that any particular temporal embodiment of the religious quest which has attained historic status emerged out of the social complex of problems, desires and hopes of a social situation. If religion is to be vital, each age must create its own. This was the function of modernists in the past and our age has no lack of modernizers. The trouble is that they are inadequate. Only a few realize how radical must be the change in thought and program if religion is to hold its rôle of leadership and guidance in the new world. When fundamentalists confidently proclaim the age-old truths totally unaware that they are no longer true; when radicals, weary of the timid futility of the priests of religion, wear as titles of honor the epithets "anti-christ," "atheist," "irreligious;" when modernists are only modified fundamentalists with the added defect of being hesitant, apologetic and obscurantist, where is our age to find the leadership to create the living embodiment of the religion of tomorrow?

When the question is asked in this way its artificiality is apparent. Never in man's history did religion have leadership capable of deliberate, intelligent creation of the desired future. The new embodiment of man's quest for happiness came always as a compromise out of the conflict of desire with intolerable conditions. In past ages, as in ours, the official leaders were bound by their inheritance of vested interests in ideas and institutions. They were quite incapable of visualizing a future in which goals would be realized without the mediation of their precious instruments of cult and their beloved gods. Lacking the long view of historical perspective they mistook means for ends. That there might be more adequate means than God and cult and church for the realization of the good life for man would have been unthinkable. Even in our day one might infer from current discussion that it is as important to save God as to save the world. Yet it is written now on the opened record of culture history for all to read who will, that religion is older than gods or any particular instrument of cult, that religion created them as means to an end—the realization of the perfect life for man. If modern men are able thus to differentiate and evaluate means and ends they will shed few tears because the old forms of religion are dying and rejoice rather that religion has available now as never before practical and effective instruments for the achievement of a good life in a world made good.

This is not to say that the religious heritage of the past is negligible or unimportant but rather to insist that the only past which is important is the past which is present and functioning in human lives, and that this may not be taken as sacrosanct in the present because it was sacred to religion in the past. Much of our religious heritage which still functions makes for frustration, for anesthesia or the compensation of thwarted desires; and religious strategists who would lead the desires of men to that socialized fulfilment which constitutes the good life will need to consider the worth of this heritage. It may well be that more energy is devoted to preserving the past because it is the sacred past or because it serves as consolation for frustration than to finding the practical method of achieving the fulfilment of desires and the elimination of maladjustments which make for frustration.

The same thing is true of ideals. Faith in ideals may function exactly as does faith in God—a way of being hopefully contented with an unsatisfying present. The realistic religious guide will be wary of abstract ideals. The ideal which means something is the ideal which emerges from present facts as a satisfying solution of a tangled situation. Devotion to a program which actualizes ideals in life will be the heart of practical religion.

No one can view the panorama of religions in the modern world without emotion. It is a time of change without parallel in history. There is pathos in the vision if one is devoted to the theologies and institutional forms of the past for these are surely doomed to disappear. But if one sees religion as man's search for joy in life—for the happiness of human comradeship in a world from which the age-old evils have been banished, then the prospect is full of hope. A new poetic view of the world is emerging. A deep realization of the togetherness of men is taking root in the minds of all peoples. A vision of the possibility of making the instruments of science and the world's resources serve the higher life of all mankind has captured the prophetic spirits of all groups. It may be that men, after the long flight in frustration to supernatural other worlds, are now turning again with new courage to the task of actualizing the religious ideal in the world of fact.

A. Eustace Haydon.

Six Months After Gandhi's Arrest

The 4th of July last was just six months after the imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi and the viceregal enactment of severely repressive ordinances. For Americans it is therefore a fitting day on which to make a summary of the situation in India.

The die-hard Tories in England, the British Bureaucracy in India and the British business men in India all expected to be able, with the aid of the drastic Ordinances and police and army action, to crush the Indian National Congress within three months. Apparently they had deceived even themselves into thinking that the Government's nominees from Indian groups to the Round Table Conference actually represented the wishes of the various groups in India, and hence that the so-called Minorities Pact made at London between the nominees from Moslems, Untouchables, Sikhs, Indian Christians and British business men would endure.

But these plans have gone sadly awry. The Congress is very far from crushed. All during these six months it has continued from time to time in many places all over India to carry on processions, flag raisings, illegal salt-making, picketing of foreign cloth and liquor shops, boycott of British goods and refusals to pay land taxes. Thirty thousand Congress Moslems in two towns of the Northwest Frontier Province picketed the elections there in April with great success. The Congress held its annual meeting in April at Delhi, despite the police, and passed a set of resolutions supporting Gandhi and non-violent resistance. The Congress have their own secret post office system all over India. Many of their other activities are also underground. The weekly reports of Congress Committees which evade the censorship and reach us reveal between the lines a steadily increasing consciousness of power, determination and self-confidence. Even Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald admitted in his Empire Day radio broadcast late in May that the methods of the Indian Congress have raised "very formidable obstacles" to the carrying out of British policies in India.

The Moslems are not and have not been a unit. There is among them a pro-British group, another section that is both anti-British and anti-Congress, and a third section that is pro-Congress. Hitherto, the first two of these have made up the All-India Moslem Conference; and the group which is both anti-British and anti-Congress has refrained for the most part from anti-Government activities. But a meeting of this Conference was scheduled for early July at which there was expected to be a struggle to bring about an open breach with Government. Probably only a part of the Conference will break away, the others, having been placated by the constitutional changes in the Northwest Frontier Province, the reforms favoring Moslems in Kashmir, and rumors of constitutional changes favoring Moslems in the rest of British India. The Bengal Presidency Moslem League, representing apparently the majority of the 25 million Moslems there,—over twice as many as there are in the Punjab and six times more than there are in any other Province or Indian State,—has expressed itself against the communal policy of the All-India Moslem Conference. The great majority of the Northwest Frontier Province is pro-Congress Moslem. Among the Moslems of most of the Provinces the tendency to oppose Government is deepening and widening. As in the case of Turkey, nationalism among Indian Moslems seems likely to grow stronger politically than Islam.

The leading organization among the Sikhs,—the Sikh Central League,—has formally declared its alli-

ance in action with the Congress. The organized Depressed Classes have split into two groups, one pro-Government, the other anti-Government. The available evidence indicates that the latter is the larger group. The majority of the unorganized Depressed Classes favor Gandhi. There is now a formal pact between the political organization of orthodox Hindus (the Hindu Mahasabha), the Sikhs and the anti-Government section of the Depressed Classes.

Indian women have taken a much larger and more active part in this 1932 struggle than they did in 1930, in picketing, processions, flag raisings, making of salt, making home-spun cloth, boycott work, etc. Though we have heard about their activities especially in Bombay, the Northwest Frontier Province and Bengal, they have been active in all the Provinces.

It has been especially encouraging to note the unification that has been taking place between the different sections of Indians. The orthodox Hindu Mahasabha has publicly urged the admission of untouchables to all roads, wells and temples and the cessation of other caste barriers. In Calcutta a committee of prominent Brahmans has been formed to promote inter-caste marriages. A number of large public dinners have been held with Brahmans eating side by side with untouchables. The younger Moslems are opposed to communalism. We have already noted the movement in Bengal toward political harmony of Moslems with Hindus. The attacks by reckless police upon wealthy Hindus are tending to make the rich more ready to side politically with the poor. The common sufferings of city folk and peasants in the cause of Nationalism are tending to narrow the previously existing gulf between city and country. The 16th Congress "dictator" of Gujarat was an Untouchable, and a recent local Congress "dictator" in the Central Provinces was an Indian Christian.

The Indian police have used their new-found power under the Ordinances with such brutality and recklessness that the vast majority of Indians have become Congress sympathizers, no matter what their previous opinions. In India nobody but the British business community and a very few individuals of the Non-Brahman Party of South India and a very few individual Moslems have praised the Government for the Ordinances. So cautious a Moderate as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a strong opponent of Gandhi, has written to English friends that the bitterness against Government is ten times more intense on all sides than in 1930. Responsible British missionaries quoted in the *Manchester Guardian* have stated that the feeling against the Government is more bitter than ever before in the history of the British connection. All the Indian Liberal Associations and most of the Indian commercial organizations have formally and strongly protested against the Government policy. Pundit Malavia, the aged and greatly respected Congress leader, has estimated the number of political prisoners at 80,000.

The Viceroy has just re-enacted the Ordinances. It is true that the new Ordinances expressly apply only to Bengal and certain districts in the United Provinces, the Northwest Frontier Province and Bombay Presidency, but they may be kept in force or re-applied in any or all other districts of all Provinces at the discretion of the local authorities. We may be sure that a great many of those other districts will retain the Ordinances with little or no publicity, and others will enforce them again as soon as there are any fresh signs of Congress activity. There will be a recrudescence of Congress activity probably wherever the lid is taken off. Operating in this cat-and-mouse fashion, the Ordinances will work even more tyrannically and irresponsibly than before. The Indian police, moreover, will not yield up their powers willingly, and in the country districts there is not enough British supervision to restrain them. Police lust for power will increase so long as conditions provide scope. We may therefore be sure that the influences tending to alienate people from the Government will steadily continue. From those districts where the Ordinances are actually lifted, the previously censored news of police atrocities will begin to come out, to make trouble for the Government elsewhere. And when such news comes from a predominantly Moslem district, the result will be to weaken the pro-British section of the All-India Moslem Conference.

Not only is the feeling against the Government bitter on account of the brutality and tyranny of the Ordinances, but the suspicion against British good faith has greatly increased. This is due partly to the contrast between high-flown British words at the London Round Table Conferences and British deeds in India, and partly to the leakage into the Indian press of the private report by the Round Table Conference delegate, Mr. E. C. Benthall, to his confreres of the Calcutta British business community in regard to British intrigue at the Round Table Conference.

Although the Indian Princes have reiterated their commitment to a federal form of government for India, they have imposed such rigid conditions to their support as practically to prevent such a federation from coming into being or action. Apparently the Princes have been greatly disturbed by the manner and extent to which the British took charge of affairs in Kashmir when trouble arose there last autumn and winter; also by the demands of the communalist Moslems for a larger share of all Government administrative and railway positions in the States as well as in British India; and by the rise of Congress activity in two or three of the States. So the Princes, in their fear about every active group, stand stock-still, and are of slight aid to Great Britain.

The boycott against British goods has been largely automatic and also effective. The tremendous Ordinance powers of the police have made the boycott against British cloth somewhat less effective than in 1930-31, but it is strong and growing more effective, if one may judge by the trade reports in the *Manchester Guardian*. The Swadeshi or "Buy Indian" movement is growing more powerful and widespread.

Government revenues from all major sources have declined heavily. Customs duties, excise on liquor, land revenue and railway income have all gone down badly. In matters of finance, time works against the British. Probably they are hoping for a rise in commodity prices to save them, but even that would not be sufficient.

It is true that since Britain went off the gold basis she has by exchange operations extracted millions of pounds worth of gold from India. This export of gold has been an immense assistance to the Government of India, and enabled it to pay off much of its recent debt to Britain. But this advantage is largely illusory. The extraction of this gold ensures the maintenance of low purchasing power in India for long into the future and thus will hinder both British trade and Indian Government income. Probably also the resulting impoverishment of the people will tie them still more firmly to the Congress which champions their rights.

In the midst of all the disturbances the transactions and reports of the two continuation Round Table Conference committees headed respectively by Lords Lothian and Percy, to consider matters of Indian Franchise and Finance, have been duds. All these conferences, committees and reports are futile red herrings. The struggle in India is to determine who has the substance of political power,—the British or the Indian Congress. That is not a matter of words, either spoken or written. Until that question is settled all the palaver is nonsense. As soon as that question is settled the new constitution can be built quite rapidly and with relative ease.

The Bombay riots are a very ugly spot in the picture. Yet they need not discourage too deeply the well-wishers of India. First of all, remember that these riots, like practically all of the Hindu-Moslem riots, occurred in a city, and that only 10 per cent of the total Indian population lives in cities. Secondly, the worst of the trouble,—the stabbing, burning and looting,—seems to have been done largely by professional criminals of both communities, a large number of whom were recently released from the jails in order to make room for political prisoners. That is, these were not for the most part riots between ordinarily decent Moslems and Hindus, but between hooligans, or by hooligans against decent citizens of both communities. Thirdly, considering India as a whole, the friction between these two communities in Bombay City is largely offset by the increase of harmony between them in Bengal where the Moslems are thirty or forty times more numerous. The riots will decrease trade and hence British profits and Government revenue. For this reason I guess that the rioting will not spread to many other cities. The Government can limit this sort of thing if it really cares to, if the experience of former events is sound evidence. Lastly, though the effect of these riots on public opinion outside India seems important to us, its effect on Indian opinion is vastly more important, because the struggle for freedom is taking place in India and it is the strength of the forces there which will determine the outcome.

These riots may make the average foreigner think that Indians are unable to govern themselves, and thus create world opinion in support of British control. But reports from several sources in India indicates that the effect on Indian opinion promises to be quite different. These reports state that the riots were started and were fiercest in the heart of the richest Hindu business quarter; that although the Government has rigidly suppressed all incitements against itself in the press and elsewhere, it permitted for several weeks many inflammatory inter-communal incitements to trouble, released hundreds of criminals from the jails to make room for political prisoners, was extraordinarily careless and dilatory in rounding up the incendiaries and murderers and in taking police measures which have been effective on such occasions before, and was strangely lenient in punishing the criminals who finally were apprehended. Inasmuch as Government supporters have openly and frequently charged that this particular wealthy Hindu community was the main financial support of the Congress, and the British press in India is said to have been openly elated and said "we told you so" about the riots, it is reported from India that now many decent Moslems and Hindus, outside as well as inside the Congress, are deeply suspicious of the good faith of the Government in regard to these riots. Indian suspicions may or may not be entirely mistaken, but I report their existence and their alleged basis, because their existence is an important factor in the situation, and to understand the allegations helps to an understanding of what is happening. It seems likely that in the long run, if those suspicions are not removed, the Bombay riots will harm the prestige of the Government in India more than they will that of the Indian Congress. No doubt the riots set back the cause of freedom, but in my judgment the setback will not be for long. India will continue to be predominantly non-violent. It is to be noted that through all the rioting not a single British civilian was harmed or even threatened.

British officialdom, both in India and London, is deeply discouraged about the future of British plans and power in India. They are admitting it publicly,—in letters to the British press, in troubled statements at dinners of various organizations of the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Medical Service, and societies of imperialists of various kinds, some of which have been reported in the press. The Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for India, and various individuals high in Government and ruling class councils are letting this cat out of the bag. They have used force ruthlessly over a long period and it has failed. Thereby they have created such opposition that now they dare not relax the force, and they now admit that if they grant further power to India, in accordance with solemn public promises, they fear that it will be seized by the Indian Congress or its sympathizers and used against the Government.

From their high-sounding Round Table Conference talk of an immediate Federation, British leaders have now retreated to the recommendations of the once rejected Simon Report,—namely, Provincial autonomy with real power still in British hands, the Central Government to stay about as it is, and the Federation with Indian States to be only soft music in the distance. This is wanted by the British Tories, most of the British bureaucracy in India, certain pro-British communalist Moslems, and a few other Indian place-seekers. But such a plan will not placate any of the present Indian opposition. Moreover, by the time such legislation actually passes Parliament, the further repression in India will have permanently estranged a still larger number of Indians and made the operation of any British plan impossible.

Further trouble for Government is contained in the award which the Prime Minister is obliged to make in the political dispute between Moslems and Hindus. The only party that is strong enough to enforce an agreement on any very considerable number of people is the Congress, and its leaders are in jail and will not agree anyhow to such an award by Government. The Government naturally hesitates to make an award which will not be accepted or obeyed by either party and which will inevitably be unsatisfactory to one party and probably to both. It was all very well for a while to rule by dividing, but ruling nowadays requires co-operation of those being ruled, and that co-operation in India grows less every week.

Perhaps some of the British Tories think that when the new Government of India Bill is completed they can do as they did with the Irish Treaty,—shove it at the Indian Congress and say, "Take this or we will wage full-fledged modern war on you." In the Irish case that worked because the world knew that the Irish were well armed and had been using much vio-

lence against the British. So an open war would not have seemed to the world wholly unfair. But Britain could not enhance or maintain her world prestige or maintain her inner unity now by commencing large-scale slaughter against nationalist Indians who throughout this struggle hitherto have indulged in vastly less violence per million of population than now goes on in any large American city and who are unarmed for organized mass fighting. Besides, a war would be exceedingly expensive for Britain in cash. The Irish analogy does not hold. Many factors of race, geography, tradition, history, psychological attitudes and methods of struggle make the two problems entirely different. The Indian masses have tasted power, and their appetite now will not stop short of full independence.

The longer Gandhi and the other Congress leaders stay in jail, the stronger does their influence become. If Gandhi were to die in jail, that event would seal the fate of the British Empire. The longer the settlement is postponed, the more British prestige dwindles abroad. The population is vast; there have been many deep social fissures and a lack of political consciousness among the masses. But the method of struggle—non-violent resistance — is healing those fissures, British policy and economic pressure are rapidly creating political consciousness, political unity is steadily growing, and the cultural and political purpose of 350 million people is gathering momentum. In reality the Congress has gained power and the Government and its supporters have lost power much more rapidly than during the first six months of the 1930 struggle. Lord Irwin's repression ended in less than a year because there was an alternative policy which then had a slim chance of success. For Lord Willingdon there is now no alternative that has even the ghost of a show, so the repression may last more than a year. But the longer it lasts the greater will be the British loss and the more complete the Indian freedom.

RICHARD B. GREGG.

Highways and Byways

One hears much nowadays of "Conservation of Wild Flowers" (the Natural Flora), "Retaining the Beauty of Rural Communities," "Beautifying the Roadsides," etc., and what does one see? Every vestige of beauty removed; The road commissioners come along with their scythes, axes, saws, picks and shovels; they clear away hazel and sumac, wild cucumber, clematis and grape, goldenrod and aster; they spare not even the trees; wild cherry, crab and plum become naught but tangled branches and sprawling roots upon the roadside. I know a once-lovely lane, bordered by giant maples, planted by early settlers—so beautiful and majestic that all who traversed it stopped to marvel and admire. Then came the war hysteria, and these trees were cut almost to the ground, because—forsooth!—they cast their beautiful shade upon a prosaic potato field! Oh, yes, our people must have food to eat during such a critical time, and our soldiers must be fed. Food to waste, and beauty to be destroyed! But Nature was not to be baffled; bravely she set to work, and, in a few years, pyramids of green leaves rose from the ugly stumps, and slender branches pushed their way skyward. Then came a second invasion, and the hand of man again despoiled the beauty. The road commissioners decided that the roots interfered with good roads; again they descended upon them—this time succeeding in complete annihiliation. And the result? A good road? No, one of the poorest roads thereabout—a road which one avoids when possible.

"Beautifying the Roadsides" is the present cry. They have been beautified—by mangy gardens in conventional squares, circles, and crescents, planted with red geraniums, yellow nasturtiums, and multi-colored zinnias, which offend the eye. Years ago, the countryside was known by affectionate names: "Cathedral Lane," where the road, bordered by pollarded willows, which almost met overhead, wandered over a rustic bridge across a little stream; the "Hill of Despair," at the crest of which one was rewarded for the strenuous climb by a tangle of wild raspberries and blackberries, brilliant wild flowers and ground cherries; the "Slough of Despond," where low bush blueberries mingled their red and yellow leaves and pale blueberries with the green mosses, where wild Turk's cap lilies grew in profusion, where even an occasional lady slipper was to be found; "Thunder Bridge," which rattled and groaned as one drove across the loose planks, but from which one saw, in the autumn, the marshes, on either side, heaven's own blue with masses of fringed gentians. Then they were sacred places. The few who made the effort to reach them entered in a reverent mood. But what of them now? Roads filled with fallen branches in which sheep and hogs wander; marshes half-drained from which the farmer cuts an occasional crop of hay. "Cathedral Lane" is—nothing; the road, shorn of its beauty, ambles on to—nowhere; a straight road leads up the "Hill of Despair," and despair it is! The "Slough of Despond"? Almost forgotten. A new cement bridge has replaced old "Thunder," and the farmer cuts just enough hay to ruin the gentians.

But I can tell you of a wild flower garden that is "a thing of beauty and a joy forever." The mistress of it has, for years, dug and transplanted; yea, verily, by the sweat of her brow and the blood of her hands she made it. An irregular, secluded border it is now, dividing her property from the neighbors. The few old trees were not disturbed; maple, oak, mountain ash, and quaking aspen still hold sway; an occasional honeysuckle or hack-shrub still flourishes, bitter-sweet, wild cucumber, hops and grape still clamber over the old fence; but beneath them are almost every known wild flower and fern which can be found for miles around. Tenderly she dug and transplanted them. From semi-fallen stone fences she dug the blood-root; her own grounds furnished most of the spring beauties and shooting stars; hepatica was to be had, for the digging, along the roadsides; meadows furnished

the wild lillies (and in those days, the farmers readily gave permission to dig them); ferns were gathered from unused quarries, ravines and shady glens; wild lady slippers from many strange places—along railroad tracks, in the swamps, snuggled in the woods, out in the blazing sun; trillium, Jack-in-the-pulpits, and May apples, nestling close to decaying stumps; phlox, blue, pink, and white, were taken from the cinder-beds along the railways. During May and June her home is gay with bowls of red and yellow columbine, moccasin flowers, hepatica, violets—and bloom follows bloom until late autumn, when goldenrod and aster are succeeded by bitter-sweet, oak leaves, mountain ash, barberry, and juniper. The plants and flowers have given joy to her neighbors, for she believes that a joy shared is doubled. To New England some of these plants have traveled—many to England where friends and growers are treasuring them. And what of the places where she dug them? Are they bereft of beauty? Yes, but not by her. In many of these places the hogs root about and, too often, even intrude upon the road. The sides of the railroad are burned over every year—those banks where she was wont to gather lady slippers and phlox! Even the banks of the brooks have been denuded of violets and forget-me-not. Meanwhile, in this beloved garden, the wild things grow and multiply, clumps of three or four roots have increased to ten or twelve—their tenacity is amazing; around, and even through, the dead leaves they laboriously grow. It is not unusual to see a Jack-in-the-pulpit, trillium, or moccasin flower growing sturdily, though tightly encircled by a dead leaf, strikingly reminiscent of an old Dutch portrait—the burgomaster's face emerging from a starched ruffle. Not long ago the mistress of the wild flower garden visited a familiar, abandoned quarry where she had been wont to picnic, to watch the sun set over the swamp and river, to watch the moon rise. Did I say familiar? Not so—the place was unrecognizable. Where fine, well-shaped evergreens had formerly stood, there was now a debris of broken branches, charred trunks, and even trees ruthlessly torn up by their roots and left to die. One huge boulder, where she remembered prostrate juniper and many varieties of ferns growing in its crevices, was a blackened mass. Someone had evidently conceived the brilliant idea of cooking a supper and had chosen this rock as a favored place. How much more interesting it would have been to do as she had done in long past years—cut a twig here and there where it would not be missed—carefully transplant and watch it grow; gather the berries, plant and tend them; carefully remove a bit of fern from its rocky home! It is true, that an occasional individual despoils the countryside of its beauty, and that is deplorable, but it is nothing in comparison to the wholesale "slaughter of the innocents" which goes on daily by the officials. If we cannot look at this subject from the point of view of beauty, let us look at it from a practical business point of view—hard cash. Not many miles from this wild flower garden, a picturesque old road meandered over hill and through valley to a little city. This road was a joy and many drove or motored to the town to do their marketing and other errands. Along the top of a hill, just before entering the town, one had a marvelous view of the narrow river, winding and twisting lazily just there but, later, broadening out and becoming navigable. One day the merchants decided that a fine macadam road would stimulate their trade. Surveyors came; workmen came—hordes of workmen—and their first act was to raze the trees along the old roadside—walnut, butternut, crab, plum, maple, oak—and to grub out the shrubs and vines. For six months the work went on. Meanwhile, the road was closed to traffic, and the people from nearby hamlets did their shopping elsewhere. In the autumn the road was opened, and people came from far and wide to admire and race over its broad, smooth surface. "A fine piece of engineering," they said, "Marvelous! Wonderful!" But winter succeeded autumn and, most of the time, the road was impassable on account of snow drifts. Naturally. The road had been leveled and leveled, until it formed a gully; the natural windbrakes or snowsheds, having been removed, the snow came in great blasts. "But it will soon be spring," the people said, "and that is the time we do most business with the villages. It will be fine then." Alas, the seasons follow each other in natural rotation. Spring came and, with it, washing out of the culverts, washing out of the roads, creating havoc generally; trickles, rivulets, and gushing water—why not? There were no trees and shrubs to conserve the moisture. Another summer was spent—and more of the taxpayers' money—and for several summers that was repeated. The result? The once beautiful road is a broad, ugly boulevard—so monotonous that few choose to travel it, unless to watch the sun set over the river. Meantime, during these frequent seasons of repair, the villagers discovered that they could shop elsewhere quite as cheaply, and they could motor over roads not entirely bereft of beauty. So now again, after ten years, the merchants are grumbling that "trade is not so good, after all," and wondering what to do to stimulate it. And the farmers are putting up ugly, heavy wire or wooden paling cyclone fences as windbrakes—an unheard of thing before the road commissioners commenced their devastating work. Even now, in July, huge rolls of wooden palings lie along the roadsides, waiting for the Highway Commissioners to gather them up and store them for next winter's use. More taxpayers' money for these monstrosities.

Contrast these roadsides with my friend's garden—and many of her plants came from this very locality; each plant lifted from a place where it would not be missed—indeed, many rescued from wanton destruction; each plant loved, tended, and studied. Imagine one corner of the garden so bright with columbine that all things in it seemed discerned through red and golden gauze; visualize the multi-colored butterflies floating lazily above it and alighting now and then to sip the honey, visualize, too, the ruby-throated humming birds feasting there, or poised, with fluttering wings—their long beaks in the columbine—six or eight of them in this particular corner which they think their very own; imagine them so angry that they touch your sleeve in their excitement; their angry chk, chk, if you dare enter their precincts during sunny hours; visualize these timid, dainty creatures resting as quietly as any other bird, upon the topmost wire of the old fence!

No, don't imagine. Plant a wild flower garden, tend it carefully, and, as the years roll swiftly on, see, hear, and feel all these things for yourself.

H. S. N.

The Study Table

Norman Thomas: American Leader

Anything that Norman Thomas writes at any time justly claims the attention of any literate American. His latest book* is especially significant and interesting as the faith of the Socialist Candidate for President of the United States in the most gloomy and ominous year which has ever encompassed a presidential campaign.

The present work is a series of essays, less integrated and systematic than his "America's Way Out," but the underlying doctrines are essentially identical. It also goes further afield from strictly economic issues than his earlier volume.

The Socialist must face the problem of revolution. Does he envisage violence or peaceful changes? Thomas comes out strongly for the latter. He holds that we are living in a vast social, economic and cultural revolution. The problem of the Socialist is to see that its course is so directed that violence will be unnecessary. Even more, he has not surrendered his notion that the direction of our revolutionary age may be effected by democratic methods in a liberal atmosphere.

Mr. Thomas rightly contends that drift today means social ruin. We must plan. Can we plan for the rehabilitation of capitalism? He denies that this is possible. All planning must be socialistic planning. Society "must own or control the vital economic enterprises for which it plans."

Our author is broad-minded enough to see that national planning will mean little unless we can assure international peace. War will bring ruin in its wake even to a socialistic state. While criticizing the hypocrisy of the Kellogg Pact and of the nations who arm after signing it, he is optimistic enough to declare that "Geneva is not yet a lost battle for peace." Nevertheless, Thomas is sufficiently realistic to see and point out the futility of seeking to end war so long as its underlying causes are perpetuated by capitalistic nationalism and imperialism.

There are three good essays on municipal politics and organized religion. Thomas does not put much faith in Seabury investigations. Nor does he think that the city manager plan by itself means any fundamental change. Capitalistic politics imply the politics of plunder, whether national, state or municipal. Only a socialistic régime like that in Milwaukee will get us anywhere. Some would assert that Cincinnati under the city manager plan has a pretty good record.

Thomas's pastoral experience makes him competent to criticize the shortcomings of organized Christianity today. Most of it is extraneous to current issues and a phase of leisure-class ritual. Even the radical Christians tend to ignore the social order and to vent their indignation on the more reprehensible episodes which it permits, such as the Mooney-Billings case or soft coal mining. A humanized social religion may be a great help to the socialistic state, but it is too weak as yet to exert much pressure.

Thomas is very bitter at those critics who find in him only a robust liberal. But I doubt if this proves malice on the part of his commentators. He claims he is a "genuine Socialist." Socialism is a broad term, covering everybody from Bismarck to Stalin. Thomas undoubtedly is a genuine Fabian or Revisionist Socialist—perhaps the best type of all. But times have changed and most realistic liberals have moved up to this line. Resolute Marxians have logically gone over to Communism.

Personally, I see little in Thomas's platform which a courageous liberal would reject. The great problem, then, is whether Thomas should continue to scare away millions of voters by retaining a party name which is today as misleading as it is unnecessary. Let Foster grab off the phrase-mongers. Let Thomas remain satisfied to lead those who seek salvation by means of their brains rather than their vocal cords.

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

*"As I See It." By Norman Thomas. Published by the Macmillan Company. $2.

The British Conquest of India. India's Side†

At last we have a trustworthy and adequate history of the Conquest of India by Great Britain, written from the side of the Indian people.

This is something of importance; for up to the present time the world has had to depend for its knowledge of that hundred years of bloody, aggressive wars waged to conquer a great nation, almost wholly upon histories written by the conquerors. The conquered have had not at all effective or adequate historic voice; their side has been, and still is, practically unknown to the world.

This great misfortune and wrong is now in a measure remedied by an extended history which has recently appeared in India from the pen of an eminent Indian scholar. It is entitled, "Rise of the Christian Power in India." Its author, Major B. D. Basu, I. M. S. (recently deceased), was for many years an official in the Medical Service of the British-Indian army. His great work was published at first in five volumes, at the price of twenty-five rupees or eight dollars; now a revised edition with maps and many illustrations is issued in a single large, handsome volume of 1,000 pages, at the reduced price of fifteen rupees or five dollars.

Is it too much to say, that a work so valuable, so absolutely necessary to a true understanding of the British Conquest of India, ought to be in every important library in this country?

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

†"Rise of the Christian Power in India." By Major B. D. Basu, I. M. S. Second and Revised Edition, with maps and 50 illustrations, one volume, pp. 1,000. Publisher, Ramananda Chatterjee, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta. 1932. Price 15 rupees; or $5.00. Order by letter to Mr. Chatterjee direct, inclosing a P. O. money order for five dollars.

The Literature of Horror

This column has already carried a review of Frederick A. Barber's recent book, "The Horror of It," being a collection of photographs showing the ghastly spectacles of war. We described this book as a successor to an earlier, more elaborate, and more terrible volume published in Germany, under the title "Krieg Den Kriege!"

Now comes a third item‡, more terrible than all, to be added to this literature of horror. It is a beautifully bound and printed book, published in Holland, and called simply "1914—?" The distinctive charac-

‡"1914—?" 42 Teekeningen von Arthur Stadler. Published by N. V. Servire, Den Haag.

ter of this publication is to be found in the fact that the pictures are not photographs but *drawings*—black and white sketches of a terrific, almost incredibly dreadful power. Most of these pictures are of the scenes in battle, or after the battle—mutilated corpses, death agonies of man and beast, the trenches, the hospitals. But others are of the cartoon variety—fearful pen-and-ink parables of war in its stark reality. It is a peculiar fact—or is it not peculiar?—that these drawings seem to freeze the blood and nauseate the stomach to a greater extent even than the photographs. Is this because imagination has been added to reality, and art has magnified the lineaments of fact? Whatever the explanation, the book would seem to be "the last word" in horror. We doubt if anything more vivid could be endured.

The artist, Arthur Stadler, must hate war with a deadly hatred. We are glad that his potent pen is conveying this hatred to other minds.

J. H. H.

Correspondence

The Socialist Party and Prohibition

Editor of UNITY:

Your correspondent, George H. Shoaf, writing in the June 13 issue on "A Case of Mistaken Strategy," evidently did not wait to read the Socialist papers after the Milwaukee Socialist party convention. If he had he would have discovered that the "wet" plank, which was adopted by the convention has been submitted to a referendum of the party membership and that until the results of that referendum are known, which will be about the middle of August, the Socialist party has no reference to prohibition in its platform.

CLARENCE SENIOR, Executive Secretary.

Chicago, Illinois

President Hoover's Plea for Disarmament

Editor of UNITY:

President Hoover's bold and stirring proposition for disarmament is the frankest and most far-reaching message since Litvinoff's. It should have had an enthusiastic, unanimous response, like that of Grandi's.

I shall watch and note with the keenest and most sympathetic interest how the Hoover proposition makes its way. I still believe that immediate total disarmament offers the only adequate way to real peace. If President Hoover—in memory of his Quaker mother—could only have spoken such a Word! Here's waiting! Perhaps later. Or Britain might speak it! Or Russia again. Or Turkey or Japan!

In case of another deadlock, or low barometer, the upward path should be noted—for humanity is ready for an upward climb—why not to the top? At any rate, let us prepare our climbing clothes and staff, and be ready when the hour strikes!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Care American Express,
Geneva, Switzerland

The Teaching of Religion

Editor of UNITY:

UNITY, which is always excellent, of high literary and social merit, is especially interesting in its current number—June 6, 1932.

The department known as "The Field" contains, in this issue, a pronouncement of ethics and good sense which is rare, indeed. I refer to the item headed, "Can the Teaching of a Religion of Conduct Be Separated from Doctrinal Religion?" in which a "religion of conduct" (proposed to be taught in all public institutions of learning) is defined as "reverence for life, expressed in the search for truths which enable ALL men to attain their highest and best."

I am no contender against religion. Religion, properly defined, is as essential to the growth and development of the races of man as the air he breathes. Mankind, I believe, is essentially and inherently "good"; but he must have ethical standards by which to climb—standards which must change with changing times and conditions without conflicting with discovered truths.

Therefore, creeds and religious denominations founded upon them, which are always static, will not answer the purpose of man's ethical guidance in a world of ever-changing social and economic conditions. The world of truth and discovery in which the mind of man is ever employed to seek out his "best" (that is, his social, economic and spiritual advancement) is man's workshop and playground. It must be made safe, comfortable and congenial for all men by the acquirement of knowledge of facts regarding his existence upon earth, his obedience to the laws of nature which make or mar his happiness and advancement. If such knowledge can be widely spread, understood and put into practice, our human problems (we really have no others!) including "religion," so-called, will be solved.

I feel that great good might be realized if every public educator, every school board, every newspaper editor in the land would read and ponder this item referred to in "The Field" of UNITY. Please send me twenty (20) copies of the issue; and I will "do my bit" toward sowing the seed in the field of my own community.

SPENCER M. DEGOLIER.

Bradford, Pennsylvania

The Centralia Case: An Appeal

Editor of UNITY:

In this fight for the release of the Centralian Prisoners; the widely known Centralia Case, this committee finds it necessary to reach more and more people as time goes on.

In the past many have given us splendid co-operation in many ways but now we must reach further and interest thousands more of liberal minded and conscientious supporters to this cause.

Since the recent death of Elmer Smith, Chairman of the Centralia Publicity Committee, our enemies are trying to take advantage of this loss so you can readily see that we will have to fight harder than ever to gain the release of the prisoners. Some victories have already been won in the release of three men but four more still remain in prison and we must carry on for them in spite of all odds.

Our finances are very limited and we must do as much as possible with what little we have so we are asking you to assist us by contributing space in your publication for this notice. You can be assured of the deep appreciation of the Centralia Victims for this kindness.

Feeling that you will gladly help us by publishing the notice as a contribution to this work, and assuring you of our thanks for this valued consideration, we remain,

Centralia Publicity Committee.
C. S. SMITH.

Centralia, Washington

Whither Are We Drifting

"We have acquired knowledge, but we have failed to acquire wisdom."

Editor of UNITY:

The present difficulties of human societies most consistently prove that in spite of all our wonderful inventions and discoveries we are as a child in the midst of a vast unknown.

Many of us had great hopes for scientific researches and technical progress of the twentieth century. At last we thought that everything would be solved and our life's purpose known and directed so that everybody would be in safety and comfort.

Yes, we have whirling wheels on water, land and air—wheels that can take us anywhere in a very short time. We also have radios, telephones, photography by radio, machines that think and light that pierces fog, gas made from water, vending machines to replace salesmen, cameras that record the path of lightning bolts, and at last in Switzerland they have installed five million volt guns to

smash atoms and invisible airplanes and motion picture apparatus to catch burglars. What else do we have? Machines to record the nature of accidents, we can put news in type direct from the wire, administer anesthetics, measure one-billionth of an inch, hear light and see sound, we have big cannons and deadly gases, which in a few hours can destroy whole nations.

Oh, I have forgotten: we have magnificent buildings of exquisite architecture that are called banks, and they are filled to their fullest capacity with gold, silver and other wealth, and they also say that it belongs to the people. There are millions of bushels of wheat stored in our elevators, our warehouses and wholesalers are overstocked with all kinds of food, orchards and farms have trees breaking down under the crop of fruits and overloaded with vegetables which are decaying—and yet, millions of people are hungry and many of them dying of hunger.

What a tragedy—what a shame for our civilization! We have just read in a Berlin newspaper that in Germany huge quantities of sugar are thrown away in order to make secure for what is left higher prices which offset the loss many times over.

Further we read: The Dutch East Indian Trading Company had hundreds of tons of spices destroyed in order to keep up the prices.

The United States and Egypt have burnt up cotton crops for the same purpose. How many if not all unemployed could have been cheaply clothed if the cotton had not been destroyed?

In Africa, diamonds lie about for the taking. This region has been shut off by barbed wire fence and police guards, so the stones may stay where they are.

The motor car dealers' association in the U. S. A. has been buying up old cars for the purpose of burning them up—in order to protect the prices of the new cars coming from the factories.

Tailors' associations in the United States and Canada have been burning up new clothing in order to keep up the price and to force new styles on the public.

Wheat and other grains have been used for firing stoves by the farmers of Canada and the United States.

I could continue for quite a while in bringing up more facts, but I believe this is enough—such is the picture of our boasted progress. The human race has fallen into the greatest gambling orgy history has ever known. We have lost the essense of human qualities: commercialism-mammonism is being made the foundation of our life instead. We have commercialized everything; ethics, religion, education, economics, etc. Commercialism-mammonism has developed itself into everyday philosophy—it is our God, our hope and our religion. We all worship this terrible monster.

The only hope to solve the world's problems, including this of unemployment, is to apply at once the method of the great Reformer from Galilee: his social teachings were never accepted nor applied from the very beginning. And, the so-called christian churches have buried themselves in empty dogmatism and thus have become the greatest evil on the path of true Christianity—we have acquired knowledge of every kind very rapidly, but we failed to acquire wisdom—the great knowledge of history—without which life is meaningless.

English statesmen in 1915 found consolation in saying that this terrible conflict of hatred and destruction is a bridge over which we are to cross into a new and better world. Everybody believed it was so. And we crossed the bridge, but we find ourselves in the same old world, if not worse, for the present aspect is vastly more serious than that of the pre-war period.

If we will not be serious within ourselves and if we will not realize that something radical has to be done to prevent another world catastrophe, we shall surely be led into another wholesale slaughter as in 1915. There is very little hope that we will arrive anywhere if we continue to be dumb to ourselves.

The question, "What is life?" is very simple; life is immortality and brotherhood of all humans, not in words, but in deeds—it is more than words, self-sacrifice should be the goal of our life: "One for all and all for one!"

We are to be ready to rather die than to kill, rather to take up the cross than the sword. Then and only then will we realize the purpose of our journey through this life, but as long as egoism, or commercialism-mammonism control our whole beings—all efforts are in vain!

P. Maloff.

Trums, B. C.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 306)

Table Conference and the Dyarchic system will now be apparent so far as its main constituents are concerned. The Communal question, however, has also the strongest connections with the Dyarchic constitution, for the electorates were arranged on a communal basis (Moslem and non-Moslem). This had given rise to keen competition for privileges between the Hindus and the Moslems among the propertied classes—that is to say, between those Hindus and those Moslems who were concerned with *Government appointments and seats in the legislatures.*

It will be immediately clear that only an infinitesimal proportion of the Indian public is concerned with this squabble for the spoils of office and the "honor" of co-operating with the British bureaucracy. The rest of India is not interested in this question, for the simple reason that it is chiefly concerned in ridding itself of both the bureaucracy and its Indian satellites in order to live and breathe. To say that the Communal problem does not exist for the rest of India would be an exaggeration; though a brief analysis of this problem (as given in *India Calling*, the F. O. I. pamphlet) is sufficient to show how distorted are the popular notions both of the problem itself and of its causes. But we can safely say that the interests represented by the Agha Khan and his colleagues at the Conference were as irrelevant to the needs of the Moslem peasantry as the claims of the Indian princes were to the rights of their oppressed subjects. In point of fact the communal problem, in so far as it ever existed, had already been settled by an agreement between Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Ansari, the Moslem Nationalist leader; and today (in spite of frantic efforts on the Government's part to sow discord between the Hindus and the Moslems at Chittagong and elsewhere) Moslems contribute more than their full quota to the Civil Resisters in prison, in proportion to their numerical strength in the country.

The position of the princes I hope to deal with separately. I will conclude this article by referring the reader to that amazing document recently circulated by the "Royalist Association" of Calcutta among its members. This "strictly confidential" document came into the hands of the *Free Press Journal*, which published it *in extenso* in its issue of March 20th. The Royalist Association were unable to deny its authenticity.

The gist of this document is a complete vindication of all that has been alleged by Congress "extremists" and their friends in England against the intrigues of St. James's Palace. Some reference to it will be found in the April number of the *Bulletin*. No isolated quotations can do justice to its full purport and implications. Here, at last, the Conference appears in its true colors "staged as part of Great Britain's set policy."

The value of the Conference was its "educative effect" on the British public, who "were able, with the help of the Press, to appreciate better than they had ever done before how impossible some of the demands were that were put forward." And behind the stage-front of this carefully packed Conference Mr. Benthall tells how he and his colleagues of the European Association "picked their way through a maze of back-stair intrigue."

Reginald Reynolds.

American-German Cultural Co-operation

Die Deutsche Akademie of Munich, Germany, whose object is to promote cultural co-operation between Germany and other countries, about a year ago, organized a special *"Committee on Cultural Co-operation between America and Germany."* Many prominent Americans and Germans are members of this committee. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, Dr. Stephen G. Duggan of the Institute of International Education, Ex-Ambassador Dr. Houghton, Ex-Ambassador Dr. Schurmann, Prof. Dr. William Shepherd of Columbia University, Mr. Oswald G. Villard, the Editor of "Nation," Prof. Dr. W. Cooper of Stanford University, Prof. Hohlfeld of the University of Wisconsin, Mrs. L. H. Fradkin of Montclair, N. J., Dr.

Taraknath Das of New York, Dr. von Klenze, formerly of the City College of New York and others are American members.

One of the first acts of this Committee on Cultural Relations between America and Germany of *Die Deutsche Akademie* has been to make arrangements for celebrating the Two Hundredth Anniversary of George Washington's birthday in various German culture centers. *Die Deutsche Akademie*, in cooperation with Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, has arranged that an American professor will deliver lectures on America and George Washington in various German universities, so that the German public will be better acquainted with an important phase of American history. Prof. Dr. Karl Wittke of Ohio State University and a member of the Executive Committee of American Historical Society has been invited to carry out this responsible task. Prof. Wittke will lecture in the following German universities: Berlin, Breslau, Dresden, Halle, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Freiburg, Frankfurt, Magdeburg, Kiel, Karlsruhe and Stuttgart. The following are some of the topics of his lectures: Europe's Part in the Development of America, Germans and the American Revolution, Washington—the First American President, Washington's Part in the Formation of the Federal Government, Washington—the Prophet of Westward Expansion and Washington's Foreign Policy. *Die Deutsche Akademie* has also arranged that Prof. Wittke will be able to speak over radio from Munich and Berlin on the American Political Parties and the issues of the 1932 election.

Die Deutsche Akademie is fully convinced that it is of vital importance that the German people should have adequate knowledge of American History and Civilization. It cherishes the hope that, through American support and co-operation, a George Washington Professorship of American History and Civilization will be established in connection with the University of Munich. The Bavarian Ministry of Education and the city administration of Munich are supporting the idea.

There are thousands of American citizens and educators who are interested in promoting cultural co-operation between Germany and the United States; and *Die Deutsche Akademie* will be glad to receive their co-operation in this laudable enterprise. Those who are interested in promoting friendly relations with Germany and the United States, through cultural co-operation, may communicate with the Honorary Secretary, Committee on Cultural Relations between America and Germany, *Die Deutsche Akademie* ("Residenz"), *Munich*, Germany.

Kagawa Still Carries On

Contrary to reports recently circulated in America, Mr. Kagawa is not in prison. Thus far Japanese Christian leadership has shown little inclination toward that type of vicarious pacifism. So far as this writer knows, only one Christian has been imprisoned for too outspoken opposition to recent Japanese policies in Manchuria and Shanghai, and factors other than pacifist entered into his incarceration, I understand. Mr. Kagawa, in addressing a group of Christian missionaries last Friday, told us that there were too many factors involved in Japan's recent and present situation to make advisable and valuable any mere public declaration in opposition to Japan's militarists. There are, he says, four types of pacifists in the world today: (1) sentimental pacifists (public speakers and other enthusiasts); (2) moral pacifists (including the conscientious objectors); (3) rational pacifists (organizers of the League of Nations, peace conventions, disarmament conferences, etc., and believers in the efficacy of these to prevent war, even though the crying injustices of the present world order be unchanged); (4) "cooperative" pacifists (those who give their energies to laying economically and socially just foundations for future peace, yet realize that until such justice obtains and a fair distribution of the world's goods is realized causes of war will persist and acquisition by fighting will continue to be popularly preferable to starvation and loss of self-respect.)

Mr. Kagawa is primarily interested, he says, in setting up such a righteous economic order as will make unnecessary and unthinkable forceful acquisition of economic opportunities. Mr. Kagawa gives us to understand that he has no sympathy with his country's militarists, but neither does he desire, by adherence to any of the other forms of pacifism, to play his fellow countrymen into the hands of other equally unscrupulous nations who by exclusion and discrimination are driving the Japanese to desperation. A typical Kagawa statement: "The Japanese were long since driven to the sea for their food; half of the fishes of the world's harvest each year are caught by Japanese fishermen; now it seems we ourselves are being driven into the sea, and there are few who care."

Tokyo Letter in the *Christian Century*.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue **New York City**

Announcement

To be published in issue of August 15 an article by

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

"NEW LIGHT COMING ON THE SACCO-VANZETTI CASE"

In September 1927 UNITY stated: "A work of violence and horror, like that achieved upon Sacco and Vanzetti, disrupts the cosmic order, which itself must strive till it is whole again. The agitation for the release of these men, which began years ago, will continue, now that they are dead, for years to come, until at last the truth is known and heard. There are millions of men who will never forget, until Sacco and Vanzetti are justified. There are thousands of men who will never rest, until the work of justification has been carried through to its triumphant end.

All those who labored for this case, all those who followed it through the years, all those who mourned the outcome will want a copy of this issue.

SEND NOW

For extra copies at 10 cents each to

Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago